

REMARKS

The claims presented herein as claims 1-22 correspond with the claims pending in the Final Office Action of the parent case (application no. 09/287,666), dated May 23, 2003, and which have been amended prior to the filing of this continuation. All of the claims pending in the parent case were rejected in view of Apperson (U.S. Patent No. 5,978,484).

Initially, it will be noted that Apperson qualifies as prior art, if at all, under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Furthermore, inasmuch as Microsoft Corporation, the assignee of the present application, is also the assignee of Apperson and because the present application has now been filed as a continuation, such that it now qualifies under AIPA, Apperson is not an appropriate prior art reference for purposes of an obviousness rejection. (See 35 U.S.C. § 103 (c)).

Although the pending claims were rejected in the Final Office Action for both anticipation and obviousness, Applicant respectfully submits that Apperson neither obviates nor anticipates the claimed invention.

Apperson is generally related to methods and systems for distributing and executing executable code, which can include scripts. (Abstract, Col. 4, ll. 7-10). In Apperson, the code (scripts) are bundled with ‘privilege requests,’ credentials and digital signatures. (Col. 2, ll. 46-47; Col. 2, ll. 28-32). The privilege requests indicate the privileges that the code will potentially execute on the client system and which classes of services are potentially required by the code. (Col. 2, ll. 33-43). The credentials also indicate which privileges are allowed to be exercised by the code. (Col. 4, ll. 55-59). The digital signatures, on the other hand, confirm the authenticity and integrity of the code. (Col. 4, ll. 48-51; Col. 8, ll. 34-43). In this manner, it is the code (script) that actually contains or carries the verification/privilege information to determine how/if the code will be executed on the client system.

It will be appreciated that this is different than the claimed embodiments in which the client system selectively grants or denies a received script access to one or more objects upon accessing an access control data structure that is independent of the script and by making a determination that the script is authorized to access a particular system object based upon one or more permissions that are associated with the script source and the particular system, as reflected within the access control data structure. In particular, the presently claimed embodiments determine whether access will be granted based on the source of the script and associated permissions that are defined in access control data structures that are independent of the script,

whereas Apperson relies on credentials, privileges and digital signatures contained or attached with the script itself to restrict/enable access.

Furthermore, Apperson actually appears to teach away from the claimed embodiments in which the script source is a relevant consideration in determining whether a script can access a particular object. In particular, Apperson states that one benefit of using a digital signature to sign the code (script) is that it can be verified without relying on the trustworthiness of the server. (Col. 4, ll. 52-54; Col. 8, ll. 47-52). Accordingly, in Apperson, it appears that it is important whether the script has been digitally signed by an appropriate distributing authority and whether the credentials and privileges attached to the script authorize access to an object. The actual source (e.g., URL (claims 10-11, 40-41)) of the script does not appear important or even relevant, for that matter.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are neither anticipated nor made obvious by Apperson, and that they are now in condition for prompt allowance. In the event that the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 5th day of February 5, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 022913